

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, no claims have been amended. Claims 1-5 and 13-15 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-5 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh et al. (US 6,430,360) (hereinafter "Oh") and Lewis et al. (US 6,694,090) (hereinafter "Lewis").

Claims 1-5 and 13-15

Independent claim 1 recites: "...selecting the predetermined wait period used by the video reproduction system to convert the viewing level to the default viewing level in response to one of a termination of the reproduction of the video and turning the video reproduction system off..." The Office Action relies on Lewis to show this feature of claim 1. Specifically, the Office Action relies on the disclosure in Lewis that: "Following completion of the playback, which may be determined, for example, by the ejection of the disc or the playback being stopped for a predetermined period of time, disc player 24 automatically resets the user selected parental rating to the original rating level prior to the override in step 134. In this way, the user is able to dynamically override the user selected parental rating for a particular disc or video title set or particular portion of the information stored on the storage medium." See Lewis, 7:23-7:31.

However, it is respectfully submitted that Lewis does not discuss the technical feature of claim 1 of converting the viewing level to the default viewing level in response to turning the video reproduction system off. To the contrary, Lewis teaches against this feature of claim 1. The method and apparatus for dynamically overriding a ratings limit during playback of a digital program is directed to recognizing that an annoyance and inconvenience may be caused if a user is forced to stop playback of a disc, or video title set, and reset the user selected parental rating each time the user wants to view a disc or video title set having a parental rating that exceeds the user selected parental rating. Lewis notes that in the conventional art, if the user wishes to return the user selected parental rating to the original level after viewing the disc, or video title set, the user must repeat the selection procedure to change the user selected parental rating, continuously repeating this procedure can quickly become bothersome. So Lewis discusses a user interface, method and apparatus for allowing a user to dynamically change the

user selected parental rating so that the user is not forced perform the above procedure. In Lewis, when a user enters a play command, disc player 24 compares the user selected parental rating with the parental rating encoded on the disc or video title set. In Lewis, if the user selected parental rating equals or exceeds the parental rating of the disc, or video title set playback of the disc, or the video title set, proceeds normally. Further in Lewis, if the user selected parental rating is less than the parental rating of the disc or video title set, disc player 24 automatically generates and displays an on screen display asking whether the user wishes to reset the user selected parental rating. See Lewis, 6:14-6:40.

As shown above, the apparatus of Lewis automatically generates and displays an on screen display asking whether the user wishes to reset the user selected parental rating. Claim 1 recites converting the viewing level to the default viewing level in response to turning the video reproduction system off, instead of just at the end of a disc title, as in Lewis. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Lewis.

Further, regarding Oh, a technical feature of the present invention in that passwords are set corresponding to the levels so as to control viewing of the video is not disclosed in Oh. Namely, Oh discloses that a single password is set to restrict viewing level so that a user can watch a program. However, the technical feature of the present invention to allocate different passwords corresponding to each viewing level is not disclosed in Oh.

Claims 2-5 and 13-15 depend on claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: September 19, 2007

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501